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# 1NC SPEECH

**Your affirmation has a false site of resistance. Your concerns with the “practical” and “at least we are doing something” approach only serve to feed the empire of white supremacy.**

**You distract our movement from dismantling empire to rewiring the empire. You know you can’t stop the beast from spying. You don’t poke out its eyes, you just take away the beasts glasses, knowing for sure, it will get more glasses.**

RACE AND EMPIRE MUST BE SITE OF RESISTANCE, NOT YOUR \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ “MENDING OF THE NATIONAL SECURITY ACT” -- (or whatever else they say)

Kumar & Kundnani ‘15

Deepa Kumar is an associate professor of Media Studies and Middle East Studies at Rutgers University. She is the author of Islamophobia and the Politics of Empire (Haymarket Books, 2012). Arun Kundnani is research fellow at the International Centre for Counter-Terrorism. He is a writer and activist, and a professor at NYU. “Race, surveillance, and empire” – International Socialist Review - Issue #96 – Spring - http://isreview.org/issue/96/race-surveillance-and-empire

In what follows, we argue that the debate on national security surveillance that has emerged in the United States since the summer of 2013 is woefully inadequate, due to its failure to place questions of race and empire at the center of its analysis. It is racist ideas that form the basis for the ways national security surveillance is organized and deployed, racist fears that are whipped up to legitimize this surveillance to the American public, and the disproportionately targeted racialized groups that have been most effective in making sense of it and organizing opposition. This is as true today as it has been historically: race and state surveillance are intertwined in the history of US capitalism. Likewise, we argue that the history of national security surveillance in the United States is inseparable from the history of US colonialism and empire.

The argument is divided into two parts. The first identifies a number of moments in the history of national security surveillance in North America, tracing its imbrication with race, empire, and capital, from the settler-colonial period through to the neoliberal era. Our focus here is on how race as a sociopolitical category is produced and reproduced historically in the United States through systems of surveillance. We show how throughout the history of the United States the systematic collection of information has been interwoven with mechanisms of racial oppression. From Anglo settler-colonialism, the establishment of the plantation system, the post–Civil War reconstruction era, the US conquest of the Philippines, and the emergence of the national security state in the post-World War II era, to neoliberalism in the post-Civil Rights era, racialized surveillance has enabled the consolidation of capital and empire.

It is, however, important to note that the production of the racial “other” at these various moments is conjunctural and heterogenous. That is, the racialization of Native Americans, for instance, during the settler-colonial period took different forms from the racialization of African Americans. Further, the dominant construction of Blackness under slavery is different from the construction of Blackness in the neoliberal era; these ideological shifts are the product of specific historic conditions. In short, empire and capital, at various moments, determine who will be targeted by state surveillance, in what ways, and for how long.

In the second part, we turn our attention to the current conjuncture in which the politics of the War on Terror shape national security surveillance practices. The intensive surveillance of Muslim Americans has been carried out by a vast security apparatus that has also been used against dissident movements such as Occupy Wall Street and environmental rights activists, who represent a threat to the neoliberal order. This is not new; the process of targeting dissenters has been a constant feature of American history. For instance, the Alien and Sedition Acts of the late 1790s were passed by the Federalist government against the Jeffersonian sympathizers of the French Revolution. The British hanged Nathan Hale because he spied for Washington’s army in the American Revolution. State surveillance regimes have always sought to monitor and penalize a wide range of dissenters, radicals, and revolutionaries. Race was a factor in some but by no means all of these cases. Our focus here is on the production of racialized “others” as security threats and the ways this helps to stabilize capitalist social relations.

Further, the current system of mass surveillance of Muslims is analogous to and overlaps with other systems of racialized security surveillance that feed the mass deportation of immigrants under the Obama administration and that disproportionately target African Americans, contributing to their mass incarceration and what Michelle Alexander refers to as the New Jim Crow.4 We argue that racialized groupings are produced in the very act of collecting information about certain groups deemed as “threats” by the national security state—the Brown terrorist, the Black and Brown drug dealer and user, and the immigrant who threatens to steal jobs. We conclude that “security” has become one of the primary means through which racism is ideologically reproduced in the “post-racial,” neoliberal era. Drawing on W. E. B. Dubois’s notion of the “psychological wage,” we argue that neoliberalism has been legitimized in part through racialized notions of security that offer a new “psychological wage” as compensation for the decline of the social wage and its reallocation to “homeland security.”

# 1NC SPEECH

**WE CANNOT RESOLVE CONCERNS OVER SURVEILLANCE UNTIL WE UNDERSTAND THE RACIAL HISTORY OF SURVEILLANCE – IF WIN YOUR 1AC LACKS THIS UNDERSTANDING YOU LOSE.**

Kumar & Kundnani ‘15

Deepa Kumar is an associate professor of Media Studies and Middle East Studies at Rutgers University. She is the author of Islamophobia and the Politics of Empire (Haymarket Books, 2012). Arun Kundnani is research fellow at the International Centre for Counter-Terrorism. He is a writer and activist, and a professor at NYU. “Race, surveillance, and empire” – International Socialist Review - Issue #96 – Spring - http://isreview.org/issue/96/race-surveillance-and-empire

The mechanisms of surveillance outlined in this essay were responses to political struggles of various kinds—from anticolonial insurgencies to slave rebellions, labor militancy to anti-imperialist agitation. Surveillance practices themselves have also often been the target of organized opposition. In the 1920s and 1970s, the surveillance state was pressured to contract in the face of public disapproval. The antiwar activists who broke into an FBI field office in Media, Pennsylvania, in 1971 and stole classified documents managed to expose COINTELPRO, for instance, leading to its shut down. (But those responsible for this FBI program were never brought to justice for their activities and similar techniques continued to be used later against, for example in the 1980s, the American Indian Movement, and the Committee in Solidarity with the People of El Salvador.68) Public concern about state surveillance in the 1970s led to the Church committee report on government spying and the Handschu guidelines that regulated the New York Police Department’s spying on political activities. Those concerns began to be swept aside in the 1980s with the War on Drugs and, especially, later with the War on Terror. While significant sections of the public may have consented to the security state, those who have been among its greatest victims—the radical Left, antiwar activists, racial justice and Black liberation campaigners, and opponents of US foreign policy in Latin America and the Middle East—understand its workings.

Today, we are once again in a period of revelation, concern, and debate on national security surveillance. Yet if real change is to be brought about, the racial history of surveillance will need to be **fully** confronted—or opposition to surveillance will once again be easily defeated by racial security narratives. The significance of the Snowden leaks is that they have laid out the depth of the NSA’s mass surveillance with the kind of proof that only an insider can have. The result has been a generalized level of alarm as people have become aware of how intrusive surveillance is in our society, but that alarm remains constrained within a public debate that is highly abstract, legalistic, and centered on the privacy rights of the white middle class.

On the one hand, most civil liberties advocates are focused on the technical details of potential legal reforms and new oversight mechanisms to safeguard privacy. Such initiatives are likely to bring little change because they fail to confront the racist and imperialist core of the surveillance system. On the other hand, most technologists believe the problem of government surveillance can be fixed simply by using better encryption tools. While encryption tools are useful in increasing the resources that a government agency would need to monitor an individual, they do nothing to unravel the larger surveillance apparatus. Meanwhile, executives of US tech corporations express concerns about loss of sales to foreign customers concerned about the privacy of data. In Washington and Silicon Valley, what should be a debate about basic political freedoms is simply a question of corporate profits.69

Another and perhaps deeper problem is the use of images of state surveillance that do not adequately fit the current situation—such as George Orwell’s discussion of totalitarian surveillance. Edward Snowden himself remarked that Orwell warned us of the dangers of the type of government surveillance we face today.70 Reference to Orwell’s *1984* has been widespread in the current debate; indeed, sales of the book were said to have soared following Snowden’s revelations.71 The argument that digital surveillance is a new form of Big Brother is, on one level, supported by the evidence. For those in certain targeted groups—Muslims, left-wing campaigners, radical journalists—state surveillance certainly looks Orwellian. But this level of scrutiny is not faced by the general public. The picture of surveillance today is therefore quite different from the classic images of surveillance that we find in Orwell’s *1984*, which assumes an undifferentiated mass population subject to government control. What we have instead today in the United States is total surveillance, not on everyone, but on very specific groups of people, defined by their race, religion, or political ideology: people that NSA officials refer to as the “bad guys.”

In March 2014, Rick Ledgett, deputy director of the NSA, told an audience: “Contrary to some of the stuff that’s been printed, we don’t sit there and grind out metadata profiles of average people. If you’re not connected to one of those valid intelligence targets, you are not of interest to us.”72 In the national security world, “connected to” can be the basis for targeting a whole racial or political community so, even assuming the accuracy of this comment, it points to the ways that national security surveillance can draw entire communities into its web, while reassuring “average people” (code for the normative white middle class) that they are not to be troubled. In the eyes of the national security state, this average person must also express no political views critical of the status quo.

# 1NC SPEECH

**Only the privileged are disturbed by any new NSA surveillance epiphanies**

**Tim Wise, 2013**

[Whiteness, NSA Spying and the Irony of Racial Privilege](http://www.timwise.org/2013/06/whiteness-nsa-spying-and-the-irony-of-racial-privilege/)

Posted on June 19, 2013 http://www.timwise.org/2013/06/whiteness-nsa-spying-and-the-irony-of-racial-privilege/

It’s not that I’m not disturbed, even horrified by the fact that my government thinks it appropriate to spy on people, monitoring their phone calls — to whom we speak and when — among other tactics, all in the supposed service of the national interest.

That any government thinks it legitimate to so closely monitor its people is indicative of the inherent sickness of nation-states, made worse in the modern era, where the power to intrude into the most private aspects of our lives is more possible than ever, thanks to the data-gathering techniques made feasible by technological advance.

That said, I also must admit to a certain nonchalance in the face of the recent revelations about the National Security Agency’s snooping into phone records, and the dust-up over the leaking of the NSA’s program by Ed Snowden. And as I tried to figure out why I wasn’t more animated upon hearing the revelations — and, likewise, why so many others were — it struck me. Those who are especially chapped about the program, about the very concept of their government keeping tabs on them — in effect profiling them as potential criminals, as terrorists — are almost entirely those for whom shit like this is new: people who have never before been presumed criminal, up to no good, or worthy of suspicion.

In short, they are mostly white. And male. And middle-class or above. And most assuredly not Muslim.

And although I too am those things, perhaps because I work mostly on issues of racism, white privilege and racial inequity — and because my mentors and teachers have principally been people of color, for whom things like this are distressingly familiar — the latest confirmation that the U.S. is far from the nation we were sold as children is hardly Earth-shattering. After all, it is only those who have had the relative luxury of remaining in a child-like, innocent state with regard to the empire in which they reside who can be driven to such distraction by something that, compared to what lots of folks deal with every day, seems pretty weak tea.

As Yasuragi, a blogger over at Daily Kos [reminded us last week](http://www.dailykos.com/story/2013/06/14/1215645/-Alliances-Coalitions-and-the-Naivete-of-Privilege):

(This is) the nation that killed protesters at Jackson and Kent State Universities…The nation that executed Fred Hampton in his bed, without so much as a warrant. The nation that still, still, still holds Leonard Peltier in prison. The nation that supported Noriega, the Shah, Trujillo, and dozens of other fascist monsters who did nothing but fuck over their own people and their neighbors. The nation of Joseph McCarthy and his current-day descendants. The nation that allows stop-and-frisk.

Before all that: The nation that enforced Jim Crow laws. Before that, the nation that built itself on slavery and the slave trade. And before all of that, the nation that nearly succeeded in the genocide of this continent’s indigenous peoples.

So why are you so surprised that our government is gathering yottabytes of data on our phone calls?

Let’s be clear, it’s not that the NSA misdeeds, carried out by the last two administrations, are no big deal. They’re completely indefensible, no matter the efforts of the apologists for empire — from the corporate media to President Obama to Dick Cheney — to legitimize them. A free people should not stand for it.

Problem is, we are not a free people and never have been, and therein lies the rub.

The idea that with this NSA program there has been some unique blow struck against democracy, and that now our liberties are in jeopardy is the kind of thing one can only believe if one has had the luxury of thinking they were living in such a place, and were in possession of such shiny baubles to begin with. And this is, to be sure, a luxury enjoyed by painfully few folks of color, Muslims in a post-9/11 America, or poor people of any color. For the first, they have long known that their freedom was directly constrained by racial discrimination, in housing, the justice system and the job market; for the second, profiling and suspicion have circumscribed the boundaries of their liberties unceasingly for the past twelve years; and for the latter, freedom and democracy have been mostly an illusion, limited by economic privation in [a class system](http://www.pewstates.org/uploadedFiles/PCS_Assets/2012/Pursuing_American_Dream.pdf) that affords [less opportunity for mobility](http://www.edtrust.org/sites/edtrust.org/files/publications/files/nv.schoolboards.2011.pdf) than fifty years ago, and less than most other nations with which we like to compare ourselves.

In short, when people proclaim a desire to “take back our democracy” from the national security apparatus, or for that matter the plutocrats who have ostensibly hijacked it, they begin from a premise that is entirely untenable; namely, that there was ever a democracy to take back, and that the hijacking of said utopia has been a recent phenomenon. But there wasn’t and it hasn’t been.

Reaction to the most recent confirmation of this truth ranks right along with the way so many were stunned by the September 11 attacks. The shock in that instance also came from a place of naiveté, wrought by the luxury of believing that the rest of the world viewed us as we did: as a paragon of virtue, which had brought only light and happiness to the world, rather than military occupations, hellfire missiles, brutal and crippling economic sanctions, and support for dictators so long as they were serving our presumed interests. But some people — and again, they were mostly black and brown — were not stunned at all. Having long had no choice but to see the nation’s warts for what they were, and having never possessed the benefit of viewing America as most whites had, peoples of color, while horrified by that day’s events, were hardly likely to be knocked off stride by them. They had always known what it was like to be hated. And hunted. And solely because of who they were.

# 1NC SPEECH

**Their silence and lack of analysis on white supremacy maintains the social ontology of whiteness, which reifies its multi-faceted network of power relations**

**Yancy ‘04**

[George Yancy, Review Editor of the *American Philosophical Association Newsletter on Philosophy and the Black Experience* . “Introduction: Fragments of a Social Ontology of Whiteness.” In George Yancy, ed., What White Looks Like: African-American Philosophers on the Whiteness Question. 1-24.]7-8

**The power of whiteness** (white supremacy) **manifests itself in many forms, but it still remains whiteness (**white supremacy). **Whether it manifests itself in the form** of the dragging to death of James Byrd Ir., Trent L0tt`s praises of white segregationist Strom Thurmond, President Bush’s **reference to the Crusades in his war on “terrorism," or the little old white woman who clutches her purse as u black man enters the elevator, whiteness remains an synergistic system of transversal relationships of privileges, norms, rights, modes of self-perception and the perception of others, unquestioned presumptions, deceptions, beliefs, “truths," behaviors, advantages, modes of comportment, and sites of power and hegemony that benefit whites individually and institutionally.** Under the system of white hegemony, poor whites also manage to reap aesthetic and psychological rewards as a result of possessing the valued property of whiteness. Hence, whether poor or wealthy, **whiteness constitutes an invisible knapsack of unearned assets that they (white people) can rely upon**. Let us face it, whiteness is a form of inheritance and like any inheritance one need not accept it. Poor whites benefit from walking in clothing stores without the en— cumbrance of being followed and subjected to surveillance. Is it fair to say that they are white supremacists because of this? **To the extent that they leave this aspect of whiteness’s social ontology unmarked and uninterrupted, they do occupy a space of being supreme, for they move and have their being in ways that do not challenge the very white social order that comes to mark the black body as suspicious, as criminal. Indeed, they do not challenge the white power system that continues to mark the white body as preferable, privileged, and supreme. It would be like a white spectator who watches the lynching and burning of a black body and refuses to protest, to fight against this spectacle of white psychopathology.** Such a white constitutes a crucial element in the equation of such a site of white supremacy. **No longer distinguishable—because of his/her dead silence—from the one who tied the noose or lit the fire, such a white abdicates his/her freedom to speak out in opposition to such madness. He/she has become one with the mob, a white massive force, acting as one white supremacist entity. Self-consciously signing a contract is not requisite for membership in this white supremacist spectacle. It is enough that you are a white, silent witness.**

# 1NC SPEECH

**The ontology of whiteness is a surveillance technology in the oppression and dehumanization of the other**

**Yancy ‘04**

[George Yancy, Review Editor of the *American Philosophical Association Newsletter on Philosophy and the Black Experience* . “Introduction: Fragments of a Social Ontology of Whiteness.” In George Yancy, ed., What White Looks Like: African-American Philosophers on the Whiteness Question. 1-24.]

Prior to any formal “scientific” theorizations regarding racial taxonomic distinctions among people, black people knew in their souls and bodies what it meant to suffer under the weight of whiteness. After all, **black people of African descent were enslaved, owned, reduced to property, prior to any formal theoretical conceptualization of the notion of race.** There was a time when black people knew all too well the potentially deadly consequences of something as simple as looking a white directly in the eyes. In the presence of whiteness, black folk had to show respect, had to acknowledge, in so many ways of humiliating genuflection, that they were not equal to white folk. Hence, **white folk controlled the direction, and structure, of the gaze. For a black person to return the gaze would have meant, even for that brief moment, that whites had lost control on the direction of the emanation of power,** the capacity to control what and how things are seen. Of course, it also would have meant that blacks refused to play the game—albeit a very serious and often deadly game—of whiteness. **Whiteness enjoyed (and enjoys) the power to represent, to engage in the representation and objectification of the Other. This power of white scopophilia, with all of its psychosexual overtones, raises significant issues regarding dehumanization, control, fear, anxiety, subjectivity, embodiment, relationality, and politicized social spaces, and different forms of psychological and bodily comportment.** Black people, however, were always cognizant, perhaps even clairvoyant, regarding the souls of white folk, Such knowledge was important for survival. Even from the auction block, that site of pernicious white bidding for black flesh, where black people were examined like beasts of the field, having their bodies checked and poked as a means of assessing their mere utility value, enslaved blacks, believed devoid of subjectivity, looked upon the white crowd with perspicacity. As David R. Roediger notes: “The auction block gave flesh to questions of sexual exploitation and of gender. Its stark realities laid the urgent imperative for slaves to penetrate the psychologies of whites and their necessity to make distinctions even among white slave buyers.”“ Contrary to white lies, black people looked out upon the white crowd from a perspectival here, a location of embodied subjectivity and criticality.

# 1NC SPEECH

**MOVEMENTS SOLVE BEST – AFFIRMATIVE IS ONLY A GESTURE. THERE IS NO ADVOCATING A PERMUTATION. ALL YOU GET WHEN YOU VOTE AFF IS THE PLAN, WHICH ONLY REASSURES TECHNOLOGISTS THEY ARE OKAY, BUT WHILE RACIALIZED POPULATIONS AND DISSENTERS STILL SUFFER**

Kumar & Kundnani ‘15

Deepa Kumar is an associate professor of Media Studies and Middle East Studies at Rutgers University. She is the author of Islamophobia and the Politics of Empire (Haymarket Books, 2012). Arun Kundnani is research fellow at the International Centre for Counter-Terrorism. He is a writer and activist, and a professor at NYU. “Race, surveillance, and empire” – International Socialist Review - Issue #96 – Spring - http://isreview.org/issue/96/race-surveillance-and-empire

Better oversight of the sprawling national security apparatus and greater use of encryption in digital communication should be welcomed. But by themselves these are likely to do little more than reassure technologists, while racialized populations and political dissenters continue to experience massive surveillance. This is why the most effective challenges to the national security state have come not from legal reformers or technologists but from grassroots campaigning by the racialized groups most affected. In New York, the campaign against the NYPD’s surveillance of Muslims has drawn its strength from building alliances with other groups affected by racial profiling: Latinos and Blacks who suffer from hugely disproportionate rates of stop and frisk. In California’s Bay Area, a campaign against a Department of Homeland Security-funded Domain Awareness Center was successful because various constituencies were able to unite on the issue, including homeless people, the poor, Muslims, and Blacks. Similarly, a demographics unit planned by the Los Angeles Police Department, which would have profiled communities on the basis of race and religion, was shut down after a campaign that united various groups defined by race and class. The lesson here is that, while the national security state aims to create fear and to divide people, activists can organize and build alliances across race lines to overcome that fear. To the extent that the national security state has targeted Occupy, the antiwar movement, environmental rights activists, radical journalists and campaigners, and whistleblowers, these groups have gravitated towards opposition to the national security state. But understanding the centrality of race and empire to national security surveillance means finding a basis for unity across different groups who experience similar kinds of policing: Muslim, Latino/a, Asian, Black, and white dissidents and radicals. It is on such a basis that we can see the beginnings of an effective multiracial opposition to the surveillance state and empire.

# LINK – Aff Revelation

IF THE AFFIRMATIVE WAS A REVELATION BY ANY MEANS, IT PROVES MORE OF HOW PRIVILEGED THOSE WITH SUCH REVELATION ARE

**Tim Wise, 2013**

[Whiteness, NSA Spying and the Irony of Racial Privilege](http://www.timwise.org/2013/06/whiteness-nsa-spying-and-the-irony-of-racial-privilege/)

Posted on June 19, 2013 http://www.timwise.org/2013/06/whiteness-nsa-spying-and-the-irony-of-racial-privilege/

So yeah, the government is spying on you precious. And now you’re pissed?

This is the irony of privilege: the fact that some have for so long enjoyed it, in its largely unfettered state, is precisely why some of those those same persons are now so exorcised at the thought of potentially being treated like everyone else has been, forever; and it is also why the state was able to get away with it for such an extended period. So long as the only possible targets were racial and religious and class others, shock and outrage could be kept at a minimum. And so the apparatus of profiling and monitoring and snooping and data collection and even targeted assassination grew like mushrooms in the dark. And deep down, most of the same white folks who are now so unhinged by the mere possibility — and a remote one at that — that they will be treated like those others, knew what was going on.

And they said little or nothing. White liberals — with some notable exceptions — mostly clucked their tongues and expressed how unfortunate it was that certain people were being profiled, but they rarely spoke out publicly, or challenged those not-so-random searches at the airport, or dared to challenge cops when they saw them harassing, or even brutalizing the black and brown. Plenty of other issues were more pressing. The white conservatives, of course, largely applauded either or both of those.

And now, because they mostly ignored (or even in some cases cheered) the violations of Constitutional rights, so long as the violations fell upon someone other than themselves, they are being freshly confronted with the surly adolescent version of the infant to which they gave birth, at least indirectly. And they aren’t too happy with his insolence.

Yeah, well, tell it to pretty much every Arab American, every Persian American, every Afghan American, everyone with a so-called Middle Eastern name walking through an airport in this country for the past decade or more. Tell them how now you’re outraged by the idea that the government might consider you a potential terrorist.

Tell it to the hundreds of thousands of black men in New York, stopped and frisked by the NYPD over the past fifteen years, whose names and information were entered into police databases, even though they had committed no crime, but just as a precautionary measure, in case they ever decided to commit one. Tell them how tight it makes you to be thought of as a potential criminal, evidence be damned.

Tell it to brown folks in Arizona, who worry that the mere color of their skin might provoke a local official, operating on the basis of state law (or a bigoted little toad of a sheriff), to stop them and force them to prove they belong in the country. Explain to them how patently offensive and even hurtful it is to you to be presumed unlawful in such a way as to provoke official government suspicion.

Tell it to the veterans of the civil rights struggle whose activities — in the Black Panthers, SNCC, the Young Lords, the Brown Berets, and the American Indian Movement, among others — were routinely monitored (and more to the point actively disrupted and ripped apart) by government intelligence agencies and their operatives. Tell them how incredibly steamed you are that your government might find out what websites you surf, or that you placed a phone call last Wednesday to someone, somewhere. Make sure to explain how such activities are just a step away from outright tyranny and surely rank up there alongside the murder and imprisonment to which their members were subjected. Indeed.

And then maybe, just maybe, consider how privilege — being on the upside, most of the time, of systems of inequality — can (and has) let you down, even set you up for a fall.

How maybe, just maybe, all the apoplexy mustered up over the NSAs latest outrage, might have been conjured a long time ago, and over far greater outrages, the burdens of which were borne by only certain persons, and not others.

And yes, I know full well that some were speaking out, loudly and clearly from the start and have never stopped. I am not speaking to them (to you?), so relax (after all, if what I’m saying doesn’t apply to you, why so defensive, buttercup?) But so too, there are those who know (perhaps you?) if they are among those who, like Rand Paul or Glenn Beck or — for that matter — Edward Snowden had never before raised too much fuss about those other things, until it began to potentially affect them and people like them.

Or provide them an opportunity for some publicity. Hero worship. Perhaps (at least in their own minds) martyrdom?

# LINK – Silence

#### This is especially true in the context of surveillance – it operates by policing and maintaining racial hierarchy under the guise of a “post-racial,” multicultural America

**Douglas in 12** <Delia. “Venus, Serena, and the Inconspicuous Consumption of Blackness: A Commentary on Surveillance, Race Talk, and New Racism(s)” Journal of Black Studies 43(2) 127–145>

Neither the end of official segregation nor the increased diversity of the U.S. population has led to the expansion of democratic ideals. Rather, in response to these judicial and demographic shifts, this post–civil rights era has been marked by Whites’ increased sense of anxiety about the undermining of White racial domination (Bonilla-Silva, 2004; McKinney, 2005; Winant, 1997). Consequently, we are witnessing a number of discursive moves that work to maintain White racial privilege and power while simultaneously downplaying the persistence of racial inequality. Many agree, for example, that the form and content of contemporary racism(s) are subtle and covert, in that racialized discrimination and animosity are embedded in our “everyday” practices, attitudes, identifications, social relations, and organizations (Bonilla-Silva, 2003; Essed, 2002). In addition, research indicates that in this presumed era of color blindness and postraciality, the presence of Blacks takes on a particular conspicuousness in relation to other racial groups; anti-Black hostility is alive and well (Feagin, 1991; Joseph, 2009; Reeves, 1998). Furthermore, the end of legal racial separation is marked by the emergence of a “new politics of containment” (Collins, 1998, p. 35), made manifest through the application of various formations of power such that surveillance has become an important method of social control. Surveillance refers not only to the practice of observing people in public spaces; it is also linked to the rapid and seemingly endless display of media representations that influence public discourse (Collins, 1998; Fiske, 1996). Consequently, mass media have become a key pedagogical device as visual and print media imagery and narratives have infiltrated our lives in an unprecedented manner (Gabriel, 1998; Giroux, 1997). As a result, the volume of narratives obscures the increasingly limited range of ideas and interpretations that are available to us in our efforts to make sense of and respond to the social world (Gray, 2005; Morrison, 1992, 1997). Thus surveillance is significant precisely because it currently functions as a sophisticated form of suppression and control in multiracial and multicultural societies (Essed, 1991; Goldberg, 2005).

# LINK – Norms/Silence

You can be a prisoner of the distant racist past, playing your role without knowing it

Yancy, 2005

Yancy, George. - *Whiteness and the Return of the Black Body*  
The Journal of Speculative Philosophy - New Series, Volume 19, Number 4, 2005, pp. 215-241

The tall white newcomer has been situated (and *situates* her own identity)

in the role of a member of a “superior” group. As within a dramaturgical narra-

tive (as *homo histrio*), she plays her assigned role well. One might say that she

has been given a role to play from within a *distal* narrative (an influential narra-

tive of white supremacy that extends back into her past) that comes replete with

assumptions regarding how to act in the presence of a dark body qua Other. In

other words, she has become a prisoner of a distal anti-Black racist hermeneutic

that informs her actions vis-à-vis differentially “raced” bodies. Through the

performative act of refusal, though words were presumably never spoken, Du

Bois became, even if unknowingly, “a damn nigger.” Through her glance and

her refusal, she reduced Du Bois to his Blackness, a mere surface, a *thing of no*

*particular importance,* though important enough to reject and avoid. Du Bois

was no longer within the group, but outside of it, left looking upon himself

through the eyes of the newcomer. One might say the meaning-giving acts of his

own consciousness vis-à-vis his own dark body for all intents and purposes

functioned as an instantiation of white racist consciousness intending the Black

body as Other. Hence, he became Other to himself.

# LINK: Universal Philosophy

**Whiteness is an ideological orientation that assumes its philosophy is universal**

**Yancy ‘04**

[George Yancy, Review Editor of the *American Philosophical Association Newsletter on Philosophy and the Black Experience* . “Introduction: Fragments of a Social Ontology of Whiteness.” In George Yancy, ed., What White Looks Like: African-American Philosophers on the Whiteness Question. 1-24.]1-2

**WHITEs HAVE A WAY OF speaking from a center that they often appear to forget forms the white ideological fulcrum upon which what they say** (do not say) or see (do not see) **hinges.** In short, whites frequently lie to themselves. For example, a respected white philosopher-mentor of mine, upon finding out that I was passionate about pursuing issues in African-American philosophy, advised: “Make sure that you don’t get pegged? I quietly thought to myself: “Pegged? I’m doing philosophy!” lt immediately occurred to me that the introductory course in philosophy that I had taken with him some years back did not include a single person of color. Yet, he did not see his own philosophical performances—engagements with European and Anglo-American philosophy—as “pegged”; he simply taught philosophy qua philosophy. Such a philosophy only masquerades as universal. **Philosophy is always already performed by bodies that are sexed, gendered, and culturally coded in some fashion, and is always already shaped by prior assumptions, interests, concerns, and goals that are historically bounded and pragmatically contextual. His advice carried the normative implication that focusing on African-American philosophy came with a penalty: "lf you want to be considered a `real philosopher] don`t focus on something as marginal as so—called African-American philosophy."**  There are many pegged contemporary Kantians and Platonists, but since Plato and Kant are “real” philosophers, concentrating on their systems makes one a “real” philosopher, though pegged. So, it was not an issue about being pegged so much as it was an issue about being pegged as someone doing something as marginal and “insignificant” as African-American philosophy. **He apparently failed to see the historical and cultural particularity of his own (white) philosophical preoccupations and normative assumptions, thus rendering my philosophical concerns a mark of disgrace and self-imposed limitation. Like whiteness, his investment in Anglo-American and European philosophers went unmarked. Once thematized, historicized, and analyzed**, however, **perhaps he would come to understand the hidden normativity of his assumption**: “The only real philosophy is done by white men; the only real wisdom is white male wisdom.”

# LINK - “Problem area”

Being a problem….or problem area….

Yancy, 2005

Yancy, George. - *Whiteness and the Return of the Black Body*  
The Journal of Speculative Philosophy - New Series, Volume 19, Number 4, 2005, pp. 215-241

The reader will note that the question regarding how it feels to be a prob-

lem does not apply to people who have at some point in their lives felt them-

selves to be a problem. In such cases, feeling like a problem is a contingent

disposition that is relatively finite and transitory. When Black people are asked

the same question by white America, the relationship between being Black and

being a problem is non-contingent. It is a necessary relation. Outgrowing this

ontological state of being a problem is believed impossible. Hence, when re-

garding one’s “existence as problematic,” temporality is frozen. One is a prob-

lem *forever*. However, it is important to note that it is from within the white

imaginary that the question “How does it feel to be a problem?” is given birth.

To be human is to be *thrown-in-the-world*.

To be human not only means to be thrown within a context of facticity,

but it also means *to be* in the mode of the subjunctive. It is interesting to note

that the etymology of the word “problem” suggests the sense of being “thrown

forward,” as if being thrown in front of something, as an obstacle. Within the

white imaginary, to be Black means to be born an obstacle at the very core of

one’s being. To ex-ist as Black is *not* “to stand out” facing an ontological hori-

zon filled with future possibilities of being other than what one is. Rather, being

Black negates the “ex” of existence. Being Black is reduced to facticity. For

example, it is not as if it is only within the light of my freely chosen projects that

things are *experienced* as obstacles, as Sartre might say; as Black, by definition,

I am an obstacle. As Black, I am the very obstacle to my own meta-stability and

trans-phenomenal being. As Black, I am not a project at all. Hence, within the

framework of the white imaginary, to be Black and to be human are contradic-

tory terms.

# IMPACTS: Epistemology

**Whiteness is an imperial ontology that ensures subversive racism—it forecloses knowledge through violent assimilation, which reinscribes racial power relations**

**Yancy ‘04**

[George Yancy, Review Editor of the *American Philosophical Association Newsletter on Philosophy and the Black Experience* . “Introduction: Fragments of a Social Ontology of Whiteness.” In George Yancy, ed., What White Looks Like: African-American Philosophers on the Whiteness Question. 1-24.]

Within the framework of whiteness, the black is not that Other whose being calls out for recognition, whose being awaits to explode and disrupt the self-identical sameness of whiteness. For **whiteness admits of no ignorance vis-a-vis the black. Hence, there is no need for white silence, a moment of quietude that encourages listening to the black. There is no need for white self-erasure (**or at least a form of self- bracketing) in the presence of blackness. **All that is knowable is known in a single glance**, the mere visual registration of blackness is enough. The black simply is. There is no inside. **To admit to an inside is already to admit of the unknown, which already creates space for white insecurity white unknowing.** To admit as much would create a slippage between knowing and being, a slippage that could undermine white security and white self-certainty. To gaze upon the black in a typical social encounter, from the perspective of whiteness, often means seeing nothing but a body imprinted with culturally and historically embedded significations—though believed to be fixed, essential significations— that derive from the power of whiteness to map thoroughly the meaning of what it means to be black (and white). **Within the bounds of a white socio-ontological cartography, then. whiteness is the hub of economic and political power**; it is deemed superior intellectually, culturally, aesthetically, religiously, and so on. Hence one sees blackness but only through (superior) whiteness. **One sees** the black (**the Other) as an instantiation of white normativity** (the same). **The black is a white normative sign that carries a surplus of white-constructed significations; the black is neither more nor less than an extension of what whiteness is. In a social ontological encounter with a black person, whiteness does not abandon itself or stray from its familiar white scripts and its familiar acts of scripting; rather, the white body/self performs under the aegis of white normativity.** Whiteness fails the crucible of sociality. Out of trepidation and a failure to remit its own power, **whiteness refuses to reach across the social ontological divide, a divide that is testimony to the reality that there is more than the One**/the same/the white. The appeal of the black tends to go unrecognized. For this requires silence and humility on the part of whiteness. Whiteness, however, is arrogant and solipsistic (“only we, whites, really exist”).

# IMPACTS: Racism / Violence

**The ontology of whiteness creates blindness to white supremacy—their framework obscures power relations and makes violent racism subversive**

**Yancy ‘04**

[George Yancy, Review Editor of the *American Philosophical Association Newsletter on Philosophy and the Black Experience* . “Introduction: Fragments of a Social Ontology of Whiteness.” In George Yancy, ed., What White Looks Like: African-American Philosophers on the Whiteness Question. 1-24.]

**A key feature of the social ontology of whiteness is that whites attempt to avoid discussing their own social, political, economic, and cultural investments in whiteness. Many whites fail to see their complicity with the systemic workings of white supremacy.** By perpetuating the dualism between the “good white” and the “bad white,” whites attempt to mute the claim that white racism is not limited to the KKK, neo-Nazi skinheads, White Aryan Resistance, and. other white racist groups. In her insightful analysis of what it means to be white, Alice McIntyre uses a participatory action research (PAR) approach to explore how to best get a small group of white female teachers to name their whiteness. Describing an episode in which one of the teachers manages to avoid facing her whiteness through the deployment of the above dualistic way of thinking, McIntyre notes: Faith’s struggle with whether or not she is a racist becomes embedded in an all too common game that white people play with themselves. We compare the various degrees of racism. On the other hand, the participants conceptualize whites as rednecks, people with a Ku Klux Klan mentality. On the other hand, the participants label some whites as more open-minded and liberal, better educated, and trying to be ‘better` people. And then there are the whites who are somewhere in between those two extremes. The participants vacillated about their own locations on this artificially constructed continuum of racism. **In the process of avoiding the implications of her whiteness, Faith at- tempts to shift attention away from her whiteness by focusing attention on the “extremism” of white supremacy**. The interesting point here, though, is that “throughout the history of the U.S., the ‘extremism` of the far right has often converged with the cultural and political center.“1 Jessie Daniels, in her qualitative content analysis of white supremacist discourse, also raises the issue of dualistic thinking as a means of shifting the conversation away from the pervasive and systemic nature of whiteness. Discussing how this phenomenon functions within the framework of academia, she writes: **“By obfuscating the connections between white supremacist movements and the white supremacist context in which they exist, traditional paradigms “e-race’ the central importance of being ‘white.’ And, more to the point, these interpretations leave unexamined—indeed, completely irrelevant within such a framework——the privileged position of white academics, or the ways white supremacy (with all the connections to class, gender, and sexuality in place), are inscribed in academic institutions.”**3 Tracing the theme of how whites attempt to derail a direct analysis of the centrism of white supremacy, Daniels argues that nationally syndicated shows tend to let many whites off the proverbial hook by portraying white racism to be contained, isolated, and marginal. What she says is worth quoting in full: In a different milieu, nationally syndicated shows—such as “Donahue,” "Geraldo,” “Oprah,” and “Sally”—offer an important lens for viewing white supremacists because they provide millions of Americans with their (perhaps only) knowledge of white supremacists. I contend that the for- mat of talk shows frames racism, as it is expressed by white supremacists, so as to make it appear contained, distant, and nonthreatening; and, the shows in which white supremacists appear distance racism by marginalizing their views in a variety of ways. First the producers of these shows marginalize white supremacists by consistently referring to the groups as “hate groups? Shows featuring white supremacists appear with titles such as, “I’m Proud to be a Racist,” “Young Hate Mongers,” “I’m Raising My Kids to be Racists,” and “Hatemonger Moms." Through rhetoric such as “racist,” a label that only the most committed white supremacists utilize, as well as, “hate” and “hatemonger,” terms even white supremacists do not embrace, the shows signal audiences that the guests are members of a lunatic fringe bearing not the slightest connection to the vast majority of viewers. Talk- show audiences are alerted to tune in to "see what racists are like.” Framing the appearance of white supremacists in this way preempts any other interrogation of racism by the audience, the host, or society at large} My point is that **whiteness often does not speak its name, which is a function of both its power and its bad faith**. I do realize, for example, that the KKK is far from being shy about its aims, identity, and motivations. This is also true with regard to the unequivocal self-naming and self—consciousness of

[continued from previous page]

whites in the American South and whites in ~ South Africa during apartheid. **There was nothing invisible about Jim Crow or Afrikaner nationalism. The point here is that many so-called innocent whites have come to deny the racist implications of their whiteness. Such individuals tend to see themselves as (raceless) liberals,** atomic individuals whose whiteness is muted by such self- proclamations as: “I’m not a racist! I’ve never used the ‘N’ word. In- deed, I have many friends who are black. I believe that people have the freedom to be what they want to be. When I see a black person, I don’t see race, I see a person. I’ve never been part of a white lynch mob, and I didn’t own any slaves. Blacks have been given so much. They can now eat anywhere they desire. They’re no longer restricted to the back of the bus. I thought this is why there was a civil rights movement in the first place. Frankly, I’m not sure what the fuss is all about." **This form of discourse is characteristic of whiteness’s ontology. It speaks from within the safe space of what McIntyre refers to as white talk: It is “talk that serves to insulate white people from examining their/our individual and collective role(s) in the perpetuation of racism."**5 In this way, **whites are able to localize the virulent nature of whiteness, thus at- tempting to render whiteness/white supremacy an anomaly.** Hence, such events as the brutal beating of Rodney King by white police officers (1991), the sodomizing of Abner Louima (1997) with a plunger handle by white New York police officers, the burning alive and be- heading of Garnett Paul Iohnson (1997) by two white men, the dragging to death of Iames Byrd Ir. (1998) by three white men, and the shooting and killing of Amadou Diallo (1999), who reached for his wallet and was shot at 41 times and hit with 19 bullets, are seen as rare exceptions to the rule of whiteness’s innocence. Such brutal white racist acts provide many whites with ways of effectively dealing with their own white racism: “I’m no racist, because I would never do something so cruel and unconscionable? And while such whites are more than happy to proclaim their moral superiority, divulge their love of black folk, hide behind their power of self-definition, I feel my blackness defined beyond my control, slipping away from me, stigmatized as dangerous from birth. I feel that I have become this indistinguishable, amorphous, black seething mass, a token of danger, a threat, a rapist, a criminal, a burden, a beast, a rapacious animal incapable of delayed gratification, a “coon,” a “nigger,” a slick, dickgrabbing black male. I am simply an instantiation of universal blackness (read: evil). I am deemed obstreperous, irresponsible and worthy of non-being. In white eyes, 1 am an ontological cipher. Being black while living in white racist America, I um King, Louima, Johnson, Byrd, and Diallo.

# Framework: Ontology Comes First

**Only critical rejection of the ontology of whiteness can break the systemic violence of white supremacy and open space for new epistemologies**

**Yancy ‘04**

[George Yancy, Review Editor of the *American Philosophical Association Newsletter on Philosophy and the Black Experience* . “Introduction: Fragments of a Social Ontology of Whiteness.” In George Yancy, ed., What White Looks Like: African-American Philosophers on the Whiteness Question. 1-24.]8-10

The police officers guilty of murdering Amadou Diallo—notwithstanding other variables that may help to explain what went terribly wrong that day—acted from **a center of whiteness**. This center **informed their actions; it is a center that comes replete with “knowledge” about the black body as criminal**, as rapacious, as a problem. Why so many shots? The black body has been historically scripted as almost superhuman, possessing animal strength and hyper endurance. Perhaps this is why Rodney King had to be beaten so many times. He just would not stay down. “What incredible strength these people pos- sess. lust look at Serena Williams." Like the black ontologically criminal nature of Amadou’s black body, a construction that no doubt informed the decisions of the police officers, even if unconscious, the black body of a black male walking into an elevator can be seen as criminal. Well dressed, a black man enters an elevator where an old white woman waits to reach her floor. She sees the black body. Over and above how it is clothed, she sees a criminal, a brute, a black surface that triggers the white imaginary: “What does he want, my money, my body, my life?" She clutches her purse, eagerly anticipating the arrival of her floor, “knowing” that this black predator will soon strike. She refuses to make direct eye contact so as not to trigger the anger, the rage, in this black beast. Of course, not only does she **ontologically freeze the black male identity, her own identity becomes frozen. For she is unwilling to move beyond just seeing a criminal, which ultimately means that she is unwilling to move beyond her own whiteness. It is her failure to call into question, self—reflexively, her own assumptions and modes of being that is criminal. In both cases, the social ontology of whiteness has created and sustained a form of interpersonal distance partly informed by mytho-poetic constructions about blackness.** Of course, **it is through the culturally-constructed centrality of whiteness’s supremacist ontology that these constructions appear at all.** The black body is by nature criminal, because the white body is by nature innocent, pure, and good. **Whiteness sets itself up as the thesis. Blackness, within the dialectical logic of whiteness, must be the antithesis**. The black body, iii both situations, is ontologically mapped; its coordinates lead to that which is always immediately visible: the black surface. There is only the visible, the concrete, the seen, all there, all at once: a single Black thing, unindividuated, threatening, ominous, black. The white thinks that he/she takes no part in this construction. After all, it is not as if he or she ever said: “Today, I will self-consciously become a white supremacist. I will construct the black as criminal and inferior, while deeming everything white to be of the highest order." This reduces whiteness to a form of voluntarism that could be used to exculpate whites from their racist actions, that is, whites could use this form of reasoning to nullify any responsibility for their racist actions. The fact of the matter is that this form of voluntarism is naive and lacks complexity in the realm of social action; hence, it does not free whites from the duty of taking responsibility for their acts of white racism. A Freedom still remains. **One can cease to cooperate with structures of white power; cease to perform white racist acts; and, hence, help to dismantle structures of white power. Whites must come to see how they have become seduced by whiteness, and how they make choices based upon that seduction. The problem is that one’s whiteness, a center from which one has always already cut up the social world, makes sense of things, evaluates and judges, remains invisible while the discursive Held of white power/knowledge continues to open up a social space of intelligibility in terms of which the black/white body appears**. The white(s) in the above two cases are beyond epistemic humility. Or, perhaps they are beyond any means of persuasion (rational, evidential, rhetorical) that would help to disrupt what has be- come a kind of “world—picture,” There is no more to know and nothing more to be done differently. Seeing the blackness is sufficient. Judgment has already been rendered: Guilty! Take the white woman on the elevator, She looks with eyes that are informed by white mythos and structured through white historical power. The black body is therefore always already codified. She then begins the ritual of clutching at her purse. This ritual is not simply an effect of mythos and codification. Rather, the ritual is generative; it reinforces the reality, solidity, and “truth” of the context. **Through mythos, codification, and ritualized behavior the black body is then ontologized; its being gets frozen into something that should be avoided, a thing rendered suspect a priori.** Byronn Bain, a Harvard Law student, who was a victim of codificational power of the NYPD’s equation of blackness with criminality, knows the dangers of something as simple as “walking while black,” His **blackness was a site of negative ontologization.**

# Framework: Ontology Comes First

**Ontological critique must come first—whiteness is rooted in ontological exclusion of the Other, which manifests in hierarchical power relations**

**Yancy ‘04**

[George Yancy, Review Editor of the *American Philosophical Association Newsletter on Philosophy and the Black Experience* . “Introduction: Fragments of a Social Ontology of Whiteness.” In George Yancy, ed., What White Looks Like: African-American Philosophers on the Whiteness Question. 1-24.]

**Whiteness has the power to create an elaborate social subterfuge, leading both whites and nonwhites to believe that the representations in terms of which they live their lives and understand the world and themselves are naturally given, unchangeable ways of being**. As argued above, **to be known as black, from the constitutive and regulative hegemonic perspective of whiteness, means to be nothing more than black, a mere predictable occurrence in the natural world, a mere thing, frozen, signifying an ontology of surfaces; it is to be known as ah ontological plenum, a black epidermal surface, whose ways of being are presumed symmetrical with white ways of knowing. The epistemological framework of whiteness** (what whites claim to know about black people) **constructed black people as inferior through regimes of white racist discourse, racist institutions, and oppressive, misanthropic actions**. Whiteness, as a value—creating power, creates a distorted Black body! self through the use of theories and practices that define and reinforce certain conceptions of the black body/self Of course, on this score, **whiteness distorts its own status as superior**. Notwithstanding the powerful counter—semiotic systems created, sustained, and reconfigured by black people, **blacks internalized white ways of constructing the world and understood themselves as ontologically inferior;** whiteness constructed blacks as ugly, and many blacks lblt themselves as ugly; whiteness imagined blacks as uncivilized, and many Blacks came to think of themselves as uncivilized. **The white imaginary creates such self—serving specious and blatantly false constructions and knowledge claims, an imaginary that conflates being and knowing. Within the white imaginary, blackness became a trope for all things negative, that is, all things not white**. However, the white imaginary would be limited to spinning empty ideational constructions with little or no somatic consequences without powerful infra structures, white political institutions, white juridical practices, and so on, to enforce its white Herrenvolk structure. **It is the hegemony of white ways of knowing, white ways of being. white ways of emoting, characterizing, silencing, brutalizing, institutionalizing, oppressing, naming, interpreting, seeing, not seeing, terrorizing, policing, mythologizing, distancing, blaming, denying, avoiding, and inviting that act to occlude other (nonhegemonic) ways of being and knowing for white folk. To be black, to fall prey to whiteness’s (anti-black) epistemological and ontological modes of structuration, is to be devoid of ontological depth. From the perspective of whiteness vis-a-vis black people, Jean Paul Sartre’s existentialist thesis is reversed: essence precedes existence**. The black does not come upon the stage of human existence unmade, stretching beyond itself toward some task, project, end. Within the framework of whiteness, the black is already made, enclosed within him/herself. Whiteness is true transcendence, an ecstatic mode of being; blackness, however, in its ontological structure, is true immanence, a thing unable to be other than what it was born to be, a thing closed upon itself locked into an ontological realm where things exist not “for—themselves" but “in-themselves," waiting to be ordered by some external, subjugating, purposive (white) consciousness.

# Framework: Ontology Comes First

**The ontology of Whiteness replicates itself via structural violence and racist power relations—Ontological critique is key to solve**

**Yancy ‘04**

[George Yancy, Review Editor of the *American Philosophical Association Newsletter on Philosophy and the Black Experience* . “Introduction: Fragments of a Social Ontology of Whiteness.” In George Yancy, ed., What White Looks Like: African-American Philosophers on the Whiteness Question. 1-24.]

**The social ontology of whiteness is a species of racism**. Whether racism is in the heart or necessarily consisting of a set of racist beliefs, **whiteness continues to be a living, breathing historical construction, a social ontological performance that has profound, pervasive, and systemic oppressive consequences for nonwhite people.** Racism is predicated upon the notion that the category of “race” refers to a naturally occurring biological kind. It has been argued, however, that race is a fiction, a non-referring term, that race is (as the mantra goes) a socially and politically constructed category that was created at a particular historical moment to justify and rationalize the subjugation of groups of people by other groups of people. It might be argued, then, that since whiteness is implicative of race, and since race is a fiction, an epistemologically and ontologically bankrupt concept, that whiteness is itself a fiction. This, of course, would be a glaring mistake. It simply does not follow. **Although I reject the notion of racialized whiteness as an actual entity that constitutes an ontological substratum, a fixed essential thing that makes whites into naturally occurring racial kinds, it does not follow that whiteness is devoid of reference. Whiteness refers to a multitude of individual, collective, intentional, unintentional, isolated, systemic actions that synergistically work to sustain and constantly regenerate relationships of un- equal power between whites and nonwhites.** Those who are designated its "white" reap very significant psychosocial, political, cultural, and moral power vis-a-vis nonwhites. "White" actions get performed, ritualized, and calcified within the (social, political, economic, and interpersonal) transactional, dramaturgical space of the lived experience of both whites and nonwhites. Within such a context, the **constructivity of whiteness recedes and various modes and manifestations of white supremacy** (many subtle and many not so subtle) **may come to represent the “natural” order of things. Whiteness, then, falls within a social ontological domain, not a domain of ontological substances. And again, though its being is understood here within the framework of an antiessentialist hermeneutic, it does not follow that whiteness is somehow unreal. Whiteness embodies a difference that indeed makes a difference** on the minds and bodies of both whites and nonwhites. W**hiteness’s reality gets concretized through complex systems of advantage that have accrued over time, systems of differential power** (whites benefiting more than nonwhites) created and maintained by whites who see it as their natural (God-given) right to be at the apex of natural and historical evolution. In short, assuming that the concept of race is indeed empirically empty, though by no means an analytical concept, that race is as empirically based as the term “centaur,” it does not follow from this that **whiteness is devoid of social ontological import; for it is a mode of being that expresses itself, makes its reality known, through a process of world-making; its intelligibility and social ontological reality presupposes a functional, hegemonic axiological system.**

# Framework: Rejection Solvency

**Rejecting the ontology of whiteness challenges the reification of its productive world view—our framework is the only way to uncover its invisible, imperial gaze**

**Yancy ‘04**

[George Yancy, Review Editor of the *American Philosophical Association Newsletter on Philosophy and the Black Experience* . “Introduction: Fragments of a Social Ontology of Whiteness.” In George Yancy, ed., What White Looks Like: African-American Philosophers on the Whiteness Question. 1-24.]

**One way of challenging whiteness is to interrogate its ontology, its being, as expressed through its imperial and hegemonic gaze.** Indeed, **such a challenge is designed to critique the representational power of whiteness.** For whiteness sees what it wants to see and thus identifies that which it wants to see with that which is. **The power and privilege of whiteness obfuscates its own complicity in seeing a “reality” that it constructs as objective. Functioning as the Transcendental Signified**, within the specious taxonomy of naturally occurring racial kinds, whiteness **is deemed that center from which all other racial differences are constituted.** Within Aristotelian metaphysics, whiteness is but a mere accident; it is that which is predicated of something that is not itself an accident. **Historically, however, whiteness has come to signify that which is transhistorical, nonaccidental, that which exists in virtue of itself. This process of reification often occludes recognition of the situated, value—laden, constructive force of whiteness, rendering invisible its Procrustean tendencies, myopia, narcissism, solipsism, hegemony, xenophobia, and misanthropy.** Perhaps there is something ironically "Kantian" in this. **Whiteness fails to call into question its own modes of socio-epistemological constructivity, ways that social reality is constituted and regulated. Through this process of "white world-making," the construction of a world with values, regulations, and policies that provide supportive structures to those identified as “white," a world that whiteness then denies having given birth to, a possible slippage between knowing and being is often difficult to encourage**. In short, what whiteness knows is what there is. As a racist, Kant was no stranger to the reduction of what is “k1iown” about the black to what the black “is." Too bad Kant failed to see (or refused to see) the specifically cultural and racial “Copernican" implications of what he held to be true about blacks. As space and time are pure forms of intuition, those conditions under which empirical objects appear, counterfactually, Kant could have reasoned: “Race is but a social category through which I construct and constitute others as having a racial status inferior to my own; it is an impure form of intuition through which the nonwhite, in this case the black, appears? As is known, however, Kant’s own racial identity (and the racial identities of nonwhites) was constructed through the very metanarrative world-making of whiteness itself.

# Framework: Rejection Solvency

**Only through critical confrontation with the ontology of whiteness can we open space for the agency of the other**

**Yancy ‘04**

[George Yancy, Review Editor of the *American Philosophical Association Newsletter on Philosophy and the Black Experience* . “Introduction: Fragments of a Social Ontology of Whiteness.” In George Yancy, ed., What White Looks Like: African-American Philosophers on the Whiteness Question. 1-24.]

Clevis Headley draws upon Africana philosophy to explore whiteness. **Distinguishing Africana philosophy from those directions in black thought that reject all things white, create inverse embodiments of whiteness (**e.g., black essentialism), **and deny black agency through the idea that blacks are helplessly seduced by whiteness, Headley correctly emphasizes the critical confrontational dimensions of Africana philosophy.** He critically appropriates the notion of conjuring over traditional uses of the term “constructionism" when explaining “the phenomenon of making the world white.” **Using conjuring as a root metaphor for understanding the ontology of whiteness, Headley explores the many “economies°’ of metaphors of whiteness. He then concludes with an exploration of the future of whiteness, arguing that going beyond whiteness is not to be achieved through rational argument but through "a continuously affirmed refusal to prolong the ontological and existential project of whiteness.**

# Answers To: Permutation

**If we win a link that the 1ac suffered from an ontology of whiteness, then that is always a disadvantage to the permutation.**

**The privilege to think you can mess up in the 1ac and then self-correct in the 2ac is whiteness. Our link is endemic to your politics and the politics of the authors you read who strive to find “freedom” from surveillance.**

**Whiteness must be confronted first—its ability to replicate status quo power relations ensures it manifests in many forms**

**Yancy ‘04**

[George Yancy, Review Editor of the *American Philosophical Association Newsletter on Philosophy and the Black Experience* . “Introduction: Fragments of a Social Ontology of Whiteness.” In George Yancy, ed., What White Looks Like: African-American Philosophers on the Whiteness Question. 1-24.]6-7

**As long as whiteness constitutes an ensemble of power relation that places whites in positions of advantage and power** (that is, puts them in potential and actual positions of power in virtue of their whiteness) vis-a-vis nonwhites, **whiteness will never be innocent**. So **although many blacks and whites occupy the same socioeconomic status, the latter live their value-laden, color-coded flesh in ways that reinforce (and are reinforced by) the larger, systemic processes of white domination. All whites need not occupy the same class position in order for white supremacy to work. And even if many poor whites suffer under white—controlled American capitalism and have class interests similar to those of blacks, this does not negate the extraordinary value placed on whiteness**, even on the whiteness of poor whites. After all, to be a poor white does not mean that one inhabits a space of “post-whiteness.” Despite Oprah Winfrey’s wealth, she is still black. No amount of money will change this. There are many poor whites who still deem themselves more important, valued, and powerful than she, if only because they are white and she is not. It is here that white people (poor or not) live a kind of alienated selfhood, which means that they cannot be fully themselves (white) without dominating (or feeling better than) the Other (nonwhite). Hence, white “superiority” thrives vis—a-vis black “inferiority." **Whiteness is parasitic upon blackness.** Within the eyes of whiteness, Oprah, despite her talent and finan- cial success ($1.1 billion), is still inferior because she is black (read: not white). And despite Colin Powell’s wielding of political power, he, too, remains black. As long as he behaves such that his blackness recedes and takes a back seat to so-called racially neutral political policies (whether local or foreign), he plays the role of a man without color. He is simply part of the (“c0lor-blind”) administration. **Once he speaks in a discourse that opposes the white power structure of the administration, his blackness, which was always there, will take center stage and will become hypervisible.** The white historically constructed weight of his blackness will come to haunt him. In the eyes of whiteness, he will return to being just another problem, a burden, and in some white eyes, just a “nigger.” Even though Condoleezza Rice’s name is painted on a Chevron oil tanker, in the eyes of whiteness, she is deemed the embodiment of un- restricted promiscuity, a “jezebel,” a black “mammy” who makes sure that white folk are content. It is here that one might ask, “How many blacks in American have truly transcended the Veil?”

# Answers To: Permutation

**Only a complete break from ontological whiteness solves—residual links means whiteness will be self-replicating in the world of the perm**

**Yancy ‘04**[George Yancy, Review Editor of the *American Philosophical Association Newsletter on Philosophy and the Black Experience* . “Introduction: Fragments of a Social Ontology of Whiteness.” In George Yancy, ed., What White Looks Like: African-American Philosophers on the Whiteness Question. 1-24.]

Despite the insightful analyses done by whites within the field of critical whiteness studies, can black people afford to leave it to whites to name their own reality, their world? Although black people ought to praise the autocritical explorations of white people to figure out ways to disrupt aspects of their white hegemony, they cannot abandon the task to white people. **Black Social and economic powerlessness can and does continue in the very midst of white autocritique.** Critical whiteness theorists can and do engage in powerful and insightful discourse regarding the deconstruction and dismantlement of whiteness, but it is black people who must live the reality of whiteness expressed in the form of black unemployment, inferior health care, inferior education, police brutality, ontological criminalization and driving while black, lower wages, higher incarceration rates, and so on. For black people, **such conditions constitute a space of existential being-in-the-world; a space of being and suffering that is metadiscursive**. After all, after a day of theorizing, the white theorist rides back to the suburbs, escapes being profiled, walks up and down the streets of all-white neighborhoods without fear of being harassed or labeled “a problem,” and finds it easy to hail a cab if necessary. It is not enough that whites, with good intentions, thematize their whiteness and attempt to render it harmless. **The white semiotic space within which whites move and have their being far exceeds their intentions**. Hence, whites can have good intentions, but what is to be done when one’s whiteness carries a surplus of significations over and above such intentions? For example, what would it mean for a white to fight against white supremacy and yet reap the material benefits of whiteness: easily obtaining bank loans, gaining meaningful employment, and so on? **To rearticulate white identity, to render it nonhegemonic and nonsupremacist without renegotiating the actual redistribution of political, economic, and cultural power based upon whiteness leaves the coordinates of white power untouched**. How does one “unbecome” white when white America, for example, is constantly making it beneficial for one to “become” or remain white? After all, no one wants to be black, Latino, Native American, or Asian in a society where such groups are marginalized and existentially derailed. To advocate the “abolition of whiteness” while structures created by whites to benefit whites still remain in place is a nominal position at best. Abolishing **whiteness is not to be confined to the psychological sphere. It is not about feeling comfortable with one’s whiteness. It is not about confession. An effective form of white abolition must involve the self- conscious deracination of interconnected and synergistic political, cultural, economic, semiotic, psychosocial, intra-psychological, and interpersonal sites of white supremacy.** Once this occurs, perhaps there will emerge a completely harmless (for example, non-supremacist) form of white existence and white identity. Or, perhaps, the appellation “white" itself will prove needless and obsolete. After all, does it make sense to speak of a “post-white” form of whiteness when whiteness has become the antithesis of itself? What a “post-white” world would look like, a world in which whiteness ceases to possess and express hegemony, supremacy, and injustice, I cannot say. 1 can say, however, that **it is not enough that liberal and progressive academic whites (and white politicians) seek the proliferation of differences, and white postmodern and poststructuralist theorists pontificate about the death of the modern subject; for whiteness is able to survive a process of ethnic showcasing and is capable of remaining intact as the modern self dissolves into un interplay of signs, an unstable site of multiple narratives, a site of multicultural hybridity, and an assemblage of shifting language-games. No matter how pastiche the postmodern subject may become, the power of capital appears to benefit most those who are nevertheless designated white.** Critical whiteness studies is an important site of anti- white racist activity. lt should be seen as an important site of liberatory discourse, but it must remain open to those nonwhite voices that continue to reveal the extent to which they actually suffer and feel terrorized by whiteness.

# Answers To: Permutation/Fluidity Links

**Your use of the permutation as a way to discard the norms of whiteness that you represented in your previous speeches is a tactic for maintaining white supremacy maintaining and ever-shifting and re-aligning power bloc. (also a link to fluidity good)**

Kincheloe, 1999

The Struggle to Define and Reinvent Whiteness: A Pedagogical Analysis

Joe L. Kincheloe Source: *College Literature* 26 (Fall 1999): 162- .

As with any racial category, whiteness is a social construction in that it can be invented, lived, analyzed, modified, and discarded. While Western reason is a crucial dynamic associated with whiteness over the last three centuries, there are many other social forces that sometimes work to construct its meaning. Whiteness, thus, is not an unchanging, fixed, biological category impervious to its cultural, economic, political, and psychological context. There are many ways to be white, as whiteness interacts with class, gender, and a range of other race-related and cultural dynamics. The ephemeral nature of whiteness as a social construction begins to reveal itself when we understand that the Irish, Italians, and Jews have all been viewed as non-white in particular places at specific moments in history. Indeed, Europeans prior to the late 1600s did not use the label, black, to refer to any race of people, Africans included. Only after the racialization of slavery by around 1680 did whiteness and blackness come to represent racial categories. Only at this historical juncture did the concept of a discrete white race begin to take shape. Slowly in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries the association with rationality and orderliness developed, and in this context whiteness came to signify an elite racial group. Viewed as a position of power, white identity was often sought by those who did not possess it. Immigrant workers in the new American industrial workplaces of the mid-nineteenth century from southern and eastern Europe aspired to and eventually procured whiteness, viewing its status as payment for the exploitation of their labor. Such shifts in the nature and boundaries of whiteness continued into the twentieth century. One of the reasons that whiteness has become an object of analysis in the 1990s revolves around the profound shifts in the construction of whiteness, blackness, and other racial identities that have taken place in the last years of the twentieth century.

# A2: “Self Recognition of Whiteness”

**Self recognition of one’s whiteness is not the same as critical reflection on white ideology**

**Yancy ‘04**

[George Yancy, Review Editor of the *American Philosophical Association Newsletter on Philosophy and the Black Experience* . “Introduction: Fragments of a Social Ontology of Whiteness.” In George Yancy, ed., What White Looks Like: African-American Philosophers on the Whiteness Question. 1-24.]2-3

Another example of speaking from this invisible (or unacknowledged) center occurred in a conversation with a friend about the grading system of a philosopher who taught a course in Kantian ethics. As we stood talking one day after class, he revealed his conviction that be- cause he was the only privileged white male in the class, he would receive a low grade from the professor. I found his remark rather disturbing. First, he was presumptuous to think that the professor would do this. Second, he assumed that if he was penalized, it would be because of his status as a white male, not his lack of philosophical acumen. Had I taken the course for credit, which I had not done, writ- ten a paper, and received an A, he would apparently have assumed that I received the grade because I was black. At no point would it occur to him that I might have been the better student of philosophy. Given that he received an A- from this same professor in a previous course, this only reinforced his conviction that no matter how hard he tried he would be penalized for being a privileged white male. He did not show an awareness of (or interest in) how this was an insult to me. At a deeper level, perhaps he could not come to terms with his own lack of philosophical acumen and needed an excuse to hide behind. In verbalizing an awareness of his whiteness, he in fact covered over his presumptuous conviction that he could get better grades in philosophy—precisely because 0f his whiteness—than any black were it not for his being penalized for being white. Hence, the normative center of whiteness continued to hold. When I asked him how many other white males were in the previous class in which he received the A-, he replied that there were several others. I think that he also mentioned that there were no blacks in the class. He appeared baffled when l asked: “So, you’re saying that all the white males in that class were penalized because they were white and privileged? What calculus for grading did the professor use given the fact that there was more than one white male?” One could see the disturbing perplexity across his face, perhaps a hint of recognition that he realized the casuistry of his own thinking, but he was still undeterred in his conviction.

# 2AC Frontline to Neg Argument

1 - No link – We recognize racism in the 1ac

2 - Link Turn – Affirmative is a step in the right direction. If we decrease surveillance we decrease whiteness.

3 - Perm – Do the affirmative and tell the history of racial oppression and surveillance like the 1ac.

4 - Perm – Do the affirmative and join movements such as those in the 1nc to help stop the state and its surveillance.

5- Affirmative impacts outweigh – Your impacts are not unique, while the affirmative gets a unique reduction in our advantages.

6 - No alternative – According to the negative, surveillance is inherent in whiteness and whiteness seems to be inevitable – so they have no alternative – vote affirmative to make things better.

7 - Whiteness theory flawed – No brightline - Everything is whiteness and everything is ontology.